

## **REMARKS**

The title has been amended as requested in Section 2 of the Office Action, and claims 3 and 4 have been amended as requested in Section 3.

Apart from the minor amendments in claims 3 and 4, claims 1-11 are unchanged. Claim 12 has been amended to incorporate the substance of former claim 13, and claim 13 has consequently been cancelled. Claim 15 has been rewritten in independent form because applicants desire to maintain the original scope of claim 15 despite the limitation of claim 12. Claims 24-26 are unchanged.

Claims 1-12, 14, 15 and 24-26 are present in this application, and all claims stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over by Yang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,373,545 in view of Takabayashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,172,878. This rejection is traversed. More specifically, as regards claims 1-11, this rejection is traversed on the grounds that neither Yang nor Takabayashi discloses a layer of an insulating polymeric material separating thin film electronic devices from a patterned metal foil.

Present claims 1-11 are directed to a backplane for use in an electro-optic display, the backplane comprising a patterned metal foil having a plurality of apertures extending therethrough, coated on at least one side with an insulating polymeric material and having a plurality of thin film electronic devices provided on the insulating polymeric material, *whereby the insulating polymeric material separates the thin film electronic devices from the patterned metal foil* (emphasis added). The obvious (and intended) meaning of the italicized phrase is that the insulating polymeric material separates and electrically insulates the electronic devices from the patterned metal foil. No such insulating polymeric layer is described in Yang or Takabayashi. In Yang, as the Office Action itself notes, the metal of the copper film 48 (Figure 3 of Yang) extends through the apertures in the insulating tape 42 and makes contact via the anisotropic conductive film 26 and the solder bumps 24 with the chip 16. There is no suggestion in Takabayashi of any such insulating polymeric layer, and the Office Action does not suggest there is. Accordingly, since neither Yang nor Takabayashi discloses such an

insulating polymeric layer, claims 1-11 cannot be obvious over the combination of these references.

With regard to claims 12 and 14, the rejection is traversed on the grounds that neither Yang nor Takabayashi describes any apparatus in which the metal foil serves any of the purposes now specified in claim 12. With respect, the rejection of original claim 13 in the first complete paragraph on page 9 of the Office Action is not understood, since column 6, lines 28-33 of Yang contain no reference to the patterned metal foil 48 acting as a power plane. Similarly, the rejection of claim 15 is inappropriate since column 6, lines 11-64 of Yang contain no reference to the patterned metal foil 48 serving as a communication channel between a card and a card reading apparatus; indeed, this passage appears to be devoid of any reference whatsoever to cards and card reading apparatus.

With regard to claims 24-26, the rejection is traversed on the grounds that neither Yang nor Takabayashi describe an electro-optic display having a central portion and a peripheral portion as defined in claim 24. In view of the paragraph bridging pages 9 and 10 of the Office Action, it is respectfully noted that there is no suggestion in Yang, column 6, lines 16-64 and Figures 3-5 that the apertures in the patterned metal film 48 be used for attaching this film to a substrate, and indeed it is readily apparent that these apertures could not be used for this or any similar purpose. In Yang, the film 48 is only an intermediate layer lying between the chip 16 and the LCD substrate 10; the substrate 10 is continuous and completely blocks the aperture in the film 48, thus precluding these apertures being used to secure the film 48 to a substrate in the manner required by claims 24-26.

For the foregoing reasons, the 35 USC 103 rejections set out in the Office Action are unjustified and should be withdrawn. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims remaining in this application is respectfully requested.

Since the normal period for responding to the Office Action expired March, a Petition for a two month extension of this period is filed herewith.

*Kazlas et al.*  
*Serial No. 10/707,184*  
*Response to Office Action, May 28, 2008*  
*Page 8*

This application now contains only 17 claims, including 3 independent claims, whereas applicants have already paid fees for 31 total claims, including 8 independent claims. Accordingly, no additional claim fees are required for this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted  
/David J. Cole/  
David J. Cole  
Registration No. 29629

E INK Corporation  
733 Concord Avenue  
Cambridge MA 02138

Telephone (617) 499-6069  
Fax (617) 499-6200  
E-mail dcole@eink.com